|    | Case 3:02-cv-00350-HDM-WGC  | Document 115  | Filed 08/23/11     | Page 1 of 2 |
|----|---|---------------|--------------------|-------------|
|    |   |               |                    |             |
|    |   |               |                    |             |
|    |   |               |                    |             |
| 1  |   |               |                    |             |
| 2  |   |               |                    |             |
| 3  |   |               |                    |             |
| 4  |   |               |                    |             |
| 5  |   |               |                    |             |
| 6  |   |               |                    |             |
| 7  |   |               |                    |             |
| 8  | LINITED   | D CTATEC DICT | PDICT COURT        |             |
| 9  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  DISTRICT OF NEVADA  |               |                    |             |
| 11 | DISTRICT OF NEVADA  |               |                    |             |
| 12 | NORMAN T. POWELL,   | )             |                    |             |
| 13 | Petitioner,   | 3:0           | 02-cv-00350-HDM-RA | M-RAM       |
| 14 | vs.   | OI            |                    |             |
| 15 | RICK WALKER, et al.,  | )<br>)        |                    |             |
| 16 | Respondents.  | )             |                    |             |
| 17 |   |               |                    |             |
| 18 | This action is a petition for a writ of habeas corpus, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §2254, filed by        |               |                    |             |
| 19 | Norman T. Powell, a Nevada prisoner represented by counsel. Petitioner has filed a motion for leav  |               |                    |             |
| 20 | to file a supplement to the opposition to the pending motion to dismiss. (ECF No. 113). Petitioner  |               |                    |             |
| 21 | brings the motion to address issues that were discussed in respondents' reply but were not fully    |               |                    |             |
| 22 | discussed in the motion itself, specifically: (1) the date of commencement of the limitation period |               |                    |             |
| 23 | under 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1), and (2) the effect of a case's administrative closure on the AEDPA    |               |                    |             |
| 24 | limitations period. Respondents have filed a notice of non-opposition to petitioner's motion. (ECF  |               |                    |             |
| 25 | No. 114). Good cause appearing, petitioner's motion to file a supplemental opposition/response to   |               |                    |             |
| 26 | the reply is granted.   |               |                    |             |

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that petitioner's motion to file a supplemental opposition/response to the reply (ECF No. 113) is **GRANTED.** IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that petitioner's supplemental opposition/response to the reply shall be limited to five (5) pages and shall be limited to arguments regarding: (1) the date of commencement of the limitation period under 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1), and (2) the effect of a case's administrative closure on the AEDPA limitations period. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that petitioner's supplemental opposition/response to the reply shall be filed within seven (7) days from the date of issuance of this order. Dated this 23<sup>rd</sup> day of August, 2011. Howard DMEKiller UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE